

## **REMARKS**

This is a Response in response to the Office Action dated June 28, 2004. Claim 46 and 63 have been amended. Upon entry of this Response, claims 46, 48, and 63 are pending in this application. It is believed that the amendments add no new matter to the present application.

### **35. U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph Rejections**

Claim 63 has been amended to correct the spelling of “diphenylmethanediisocyanate” as indicated by the Examiner.

Claim 46 has been amended to delete the duplicate language in third through sixth lines from the end of the claim.

In addition, claim 46 has been amended to address the concerns of the Examiner regarding the following two statements: “this language is ambiguous, because it is unclear if the language requires the presence of any secondary amino groups” and “this language is ambiguous, because it is unclear if the language requires the presence of any terminal isocyanate groups.”

In regard to the first statement, claim 46 has been amended by deleting “having less than two secondary amino groups in one molecule.” Claim 46, as amended, reads: “wherein the product (A) has a secondary amino group in one molecule, the number of secondary amino groups in one molecule being less than two.” The Examiner indicates that the previous phrase was ambiguous and in particular, that the phrase is unclear if the language requires the presence of any secondary amino group. The Applicants argue that the amended language is clear and unambiguous, specifically, that the product (A) requires the presence of a secondary amino group.

In regard to the second statement, claim 46 has been amended by deleting “having a terminal isocyanate group.” Claim 46, as amended, reads: “wherein the product (B) has a terminal isocyanate

group, the content of which is in an amount of 4 % or less by weight of said product (B).” The Examiner indicates that the previous phrase was ambiguous and in particular, that the phrase is unclear if the language requires the presence of any terminal isocyanate group. The Applicants argue that the amended language is clear and unambiguous, specifically, that the product (B) requires the presence of a terminal isocyanate group.

35. U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph Rejections

Claim 46 has been amended in a manner that the Applicants submit that the amendment overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection. In addition, the Applicants submit that pending dependent claim 48 includes every feature of independent claim 46. Thus, pending dependent claim 48 are allowable over the prior art of record. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 46, 48, and 63 are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted ,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By:



Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No.: 47,751

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
100 Galleria Parkway  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948  
(770) 933-9500  
Docket No. 11301-1480